United Nations A/61/PV.81

General Assembly
Sixty-first session

Official Records

81st plenary meeting
Tuesday, 19 December 2006, 3.15 p.m.
New York

President: Ms. Al-Khalifa ..... (Bahrain)

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

Reports of the Third Committee

The President: The General Assembly will consider the reports of the Third Committee on agenda items 41, 60, 61, 63 to 68, 98, 99, 110 and 118.

I request Ms. Elena Molaroni of San Marino, Rapporteur of the Third Committee, to introduce, in one intervention, the reports of the Third Committee.

Ms. Molaroni (San Marino), Rapporteur of the Third Committee: I have the great honour to present for consideration the following reports of the Third Committee on the agenda items allocated to it by the General Assembly.

Under agenda item 41, entitled "Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions", the Third Committee recommends in paragraph 21 of its report (A/61/436) the adoption of four draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 60, entitled "Social development", including sub-items (a) to (d), the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 22 of document A/61/437, the adoption of three draft resolutions. I should like to make two small corrections to that document. In paragraph 6, Monaco should be listed among the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/61/L.4, entitled "United Nations Literacy Decade: education for all"; and, in paragraph 18, Slovenia should be included among the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/61/L.6, entitled "Follow-up to the Second World Assembly on Ageing".

Under agenda item 61, entitled "Advancement of women", including sub-items (a) and (b), the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 27 of document A/61/438, the adoption of three draft resolutions. In paragraph 28 of the same document, the Third Committee recommends the adoption a draft decision. I would like to draw the attention of the Assembly to a correction to paragraph 3 of that report. Document A/C.3/61/4, which contains a letter dated 11 October 2006 from the Permanent Representative of Turkmenistan addressed to the Secretary-General, should have been included in the list of documents for consideration under agenda item 61.

Under agenda item 63, entitled "Promotion and protection of the rights of children", including sub-items (a) and (b), the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 20 of document A/61/439, the adoption of one draft resolution. In paragraph 21 of the same document, the Third Committee recommends the adoption a draft decision.

Under agenda item 64, entitled "Indigenous issues", the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 7 of document A/61/440, the adoption of one draft decision. I would like to draw the attention of the Assembly to a correction to paragraph 3 (a) of that report. In that regard, paragraph 3 (a) should read as follows: "Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees on the status of the United

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

06-66966 (E)

Nations Voluntary Fund for Indigenous Populations (A/61/376)".

Under agenda item 65, entitled "Elimination of racism and racial discrimination", including sub-items (a) and (b), the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 23 of document A/61/441, the adoption of three draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 66, entitled "Right of peoples to self-determination", the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 21 of document A/61/442, the adoption of three draft resolutions. In paragraph 22 of the same document, the Third Committee recommends the adoption of one draft decision.

Under agenda item 67, entitled "Promotion and protection of human rights", the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 5 of document A/61/443, the adoption of one draft decision.

Under sub-item (a) of agenda item 67, entitled "Implementation of human rights instruments", the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 10 of document A/61/443/Add.1, the adoption of one draft resolution.

Under sub-item (b) of agenda item 67, entitled "Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms", the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 123 of document A/61/443/Add.2, the adoption of 20 draft resolutions. I would like to make two corrections to that document. In paragraph 25, which deals with draft resolution A/C.3/61/L.19, entitled "Missing persons", Liechtenstein should be added to the list of sponsors. In paragraph 74, which deals with draft resolution A/C.3/61/L.29/Rev.1, entitled "Protection of migrants", Tajikistan and Uruguay should be added to the list of sponsors.

Under sub-item (c) of agenda item 67, entitled "Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives", the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 70 of document A/61/443/Add.3, the adoption of four draft resolutions. With regard to draft resolution A/C.3/61/L.41, Bulgaria should be listed as a sponsor.

No proposals were submitted in connection with sub-item (d) of agenda item 67, entitled "Comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action".

Under agenda item 68, entitled "Report of the Human Rights Council", the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 28 of document A/61/448, the adoption of two draft resolutions. In paragraph 29 of the same document, the Committee recommends, the adoption of one draft decision. In addition, two corrigenda have been issued in connection with document A/61/448: corrigendum 1, which has been issued only in Arabic, and corrigendum 2, which has been issued in connection with the English text.

Under agenda item 98, entitled "Crime prevention and criminal justice", the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 25 of document A/61/444, the adoption of four draft resolutions. In paragraph 26 of the same document, the Committee recommends the adoption of one draft decision. I would like to draw the attention of the Assembly to a correction to be made to paragraph 3 of that report. Document A/61/368, which contains a letter dated 18 September 2006 from the Permanent Representative of Spain to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General, should have been included in the list of documents for consideration under agenda item 98.

Under agenda item 99, entitled "International drug control", the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 12 of document A/61/445, the adoption of one draft resolution.

Under agenda item 110, entitled "Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly", the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 5 of document A/61/446, the adoption of one draft decision.

Finally, under agenda item 118, entitled "Programme planning", the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 6 of document A/61/447, the adoption of one draft decision.

Before I conclude, I should like to thank my fellow members of the Bureau of the Third Committee for their support and help in ensuring the successful completion of the work of the Committee. Having said that, I respectfully commend the reports of the Third Committee to the General Assembly for its consideration.

The President: If there is no proposal under rule 66 of the rules of procedure, I shall take it that the General Assembly decides not to discuss the reports of the Third Committee that are before the Assembly today.

It was so decided.

The President: Statements will therefore be limited to explanations of vote. The positions of delegations regarding the recommendations of the Third Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records. May I remind members that, under paragraph 7 of decision 34/401, the General Assembly agreed that

> "When the same draft resolution is considered in a Main Committee and in plenary meeting, a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once, i.e., either in the Committee or in plenary meeting, unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee".

May I remind delegations that, also in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Before we begin to take action on the recommendations contained in the reports of the Third Committee, I should like to advise representatives that we are going to proceed to take decisions in the same manner as was done in the Third Committee, unless the Secretariat is notified otherwise in advance. That means that, where separate or recorded votes were taken, we will do the same. I should also hope that we may proceed to adopt without a vote those recommendations that were adopted without a vote in the Third Committee.

I remind the Assembly that we will shortly be taking action on draft resolutions recommended for adoption by the Third Committee. As such, those draft resolutions can no longer be additionally sponsored in plenary meeting by Member States. Any corrections that delegations may have concerning the reports of the Third Committee, including the listing of sponsors of draft resolutions contained in the Committee's reports, should be submitted to the Secretary of the Third Committee for the issuance of corrigenda.

Before we proceed further, I would like to draw the attention of members to a note distributed desk to desk by the secretariat. That note will serve as a reference guide for action on draft resolutions and decisions recommended by the Third Committee in its reports. In that connection, members will find, in column 3 of the note, the numbers of the draft resolutions or decisions on which action is to be taken in plenary meeting, with the corresponding Third Committee document numbers of the draft resolutions or decisions in column 4.

Agenda item 41 (*continued*)

Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions

Report of the Third Committee (A/61/436)

The President: The Assembly has before it four draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 21 of its report. We will now take a decision on draft resolutions I to IV.

Draft resolution I is entitled "Enlargement of the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees". The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 136).

The President: Draft resolution II is entitled "Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees". The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 61/137).

The President: Draft resolution III is entitled "New international humanitarian order". The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 61/138).

The President: Draft resolution IV is entitled "Assistance for refugees, returnees and displaced persons in Africa". The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 61/139).

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, who wishes to speak in explanation of position following the adoption of the draft resolutions.

Mr. Cabello Guerra (Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): With regard to the adoption of resolution 61/137, entitled "Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees", the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela would like to reaffirm its commitment to the protection of refugees in accordance with the 1967 Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees to the Convention on that subject, of which we have been a party since 2 July 1986. The Government of Venezuela would also like to reaffirm its political will to continue to implement concrete measures to provide ongoing and immediate attention to asylum seekers without any discrimination, as well as to prevent social exclusion and facilitate the integration and participation of refugees in community life, given the massive flows of individuals who have come to Venezuela in the past four years.

Our country is pleased at the return of more than 6 million refugees to their homes since 2002. We are also pleased at the impressive decrease in the number of asylum applications worldwide, as noted in the report (A/61/12) of the High Commissioner.

We also share the concern at the spread of the problem of sexual and gender-based exploitation and violence, as well as the alarming phenomenon of the forcible recruitment of children. In that regard, we commend the Office of the High Commissioner for the efforts made to address those problems, especially its awareness-raising campaigns involving all stakeholders concerned and its work with other organizations and programmes with relevant mandates, such as the World Food Programme and Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS, among others. Our country also agrees with some of the conclusions of the Executive Committee.

Our country would also like to express its great concern about the fact that — although the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) has acknowledged that repatriation and voluntary return constitute the lasting solution with the most positive impact upon refugees and internally displaced persons throughout the years — the resolution and its predecessors have weakened the obligations and responsibilities of States to address the underlying causes of the phenomenon of refugees and internally displaced persons. That has been made even worse this year by the elimination, in paragraph 6, of reference to the need for political will on the part of Governments so that, in cooperation with UNHCR, the problem of internally displaced persons and refugees could be addressed more effectively. The same applies to paragraph 8. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela would like to recall that, in accordance with article 2 of the Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees, it is the obligation of States parties to cooperate with UNHCR in the exercise of its functions. As established in paragraph 23 of part I of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action, such cooperation requires the development of strategies to address the root causes and effects of movements of refugees and other displaced persons.

We would also like to point out that clear violations of human rights — especially those committed in the course of armed conflict — are one of the manifold complex factors that lead to the displacement of people. Given that repatriation and voluntary return provide for the most beneficial and lasting solution, it is difficult for the Office to achieve its objectives without the commitment of States and Governments to address the root causes of the phenomenon so that, once refugees have returned home, they can enjoy a life of dignity free from the dangers that led to their displacement in the first place. The reference in paragraph 9 of the resolution to the catalytic role of UNHCR to mobilize assistance from the international community to address the root causes of the refugee phenomenon has thus been diluted, for it is not balanced by obligations on the part of States concerned and places an undue burden on the international community.

Furthermore, with regard to the phenomenon of mixed migratory flows, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela wishes to express its concern at the confused language in paragraph 21 of draft resolution II, concerning mixed migratory flows. The mandate of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees is very clearly established in the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and in the corresponding 1967 Protocol, so it is surprising that there should continue to be doubts in that regard.

Once again, our country urges that the problem of the forcible displacement of persons be addressed from a perspective that enables us to find the lasting solutions we seek -- solutions that will give displaced persons a real chance to return to their homes in safety and dignity. That is why we must eradicate the causes of this phenomenon, which produce so much suffering

and endanger so many human beings throughout the world.

The President: We have heard the only speaker in explanation of position.

May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 41?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 60

Social development

Report of the Third Committee (A/61/437)

The President: The Assembly has before it three draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 22 of its report. We will now take a decision on draft resolutions I, II and II.

Draft resolution I is entitled "United Nations Literacy Decade: education for all". The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 61/140).

The President: Draft resolution II is entitled "Implementation of the outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly". The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 61/141).

The President: Draft resolution III is entitled "Follow-up to the Second World Assembly on Ageing". The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 61/142).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 60?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 61

Advancement of women

Report of the Third Committee (A/61/438)

The President: The Assembly has before it three draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 27 of its report and one draft decision recommended by the Committee in paragraph 28 of the same report. We will now take a decision on draft resolutions I, II and III and on the draft decision.

We turn first to draft resolution I, entitled "Intensification of efforts to eliminate all forms of violence against women". The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 61/143).

The President: Draft resolution II is entitled "Trafficking in women and girls". The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 61/144).

The President: Draft resolution III is entitled "Follow-up to the Fourth World Conference on Women and full implementation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and the outcome of the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly". The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 61/145).

The President: We now turn to the draft decision, entitled "Documents considered by the General Assembly in connection with the question of the advancement of women". May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt the draft decision recommended by the Third Committee?

The draft decision was adopted.

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda 61?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 63

Promotion and protection of the rights of children

Report of the Third Committee (A/61/439)

The President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 20 of its report and a draft decision recommended by the Committee in paragraph 21 of the same report.

We will now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Rights of the child".

I call on the representative of Uruguay, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

Mr. Álvarez (Uruguay) (*spoke in Spanish*): I believe that a procedural problem has arisen. Two paragraphs of the draft resolution contained in document A/61/439 are different from those that were adopted in the Third Committee.

In the Committee, draft resolution A/C.3/61/L.16/Rev.1 was adopted, but with different content from the draft resolution that appears in the Committee's report. First, there is an editorial error in operative paragraph 12 (e), which must have occurred when the paragraph was included. The first line of this paragraph differs from that of the corresponding paragraph in the text of draft resolution A/C.3/61/L.16/Rev.1. There is also an error in operative paragraph 17 (a), in which the phrases appear in a different order. That is the responsibility of those who edited the text and could have consequences with regard to the text before us for adoption.

At the same time, we could proceed if there were agreement that the text on which we are taking action is as it appears in document A/C.3/61/L.16/Rev.1: the draft resolution as adopted by the Third Committee.

The President: In the absence of objection, we shall proceed to take action on the draft resolution as it was adopted in Third Committee, that is, as it appears in document A/C.3/61/L.16/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

The draft resolution was adopted by 185 votes to 1 (resolution 61/146).

The President: We turn now to the draft decision entitled "Report of the Committee on the Rights of the Child". May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt the draft decision recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 21 of its report (A/61/439)?

The draft decision was adopted.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic for an explanation of vote on the resolution just adopted.

Mr. Ali (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): The Assembly has just adopted resolution 61/146, on the rights of the child. My delegation voted in favour.

The Syrian Arab Republic is working on the ground, within its legislative and legal frameworks, to defend and strengthen childhood and the rights of the child. My country has acceded to the Convention on the Rights of the Child and its two Optional Protocols. We have no objection whatsoever to the substance of the resolution just adopted, and we appreciate the efforts made by the countries that presented it.

However, we reserve the right to interpret operative paragraphs 8, 10, 11 and 28 of the resolution in the light of our national legislation, because our views on those matters were not taken into account during the informal consultations.

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 63?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 64

Indigenous issues

Report of the Third Committee (A/61/440)

The President: The Assembly has before it a draft decision recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. The draft decision is entitled "Documents considered by the General Assembly in connection with indigenous issues". May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt it?

The draft decision was adopted.

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 64?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 65

Elimination of racism and racial discrimination

Report of the Third Committee (A/61/441)

The President: The Assembly has before it three draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 23 of its report. We will now take a decision on draft resolutions I, II and III.

Draft resolution I is entitled "Inadmissibility of certain practices that contribute to fuelling contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand,

Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Japan, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Cape Verde, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu

Draft resolution I was adopted by 121 votes to 4, with 60 abstentions (resolution 61/147).

The President: Draft resolution II is entitled "International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination". The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 61/148).

The President: Draft resolution III is entitled "Global efforts for the total elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance and the comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

Australia, Canada, Marshall Islands, Palau

Draft resolution III was adopted by 179 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions (resolution 61/149).

The President: I give the floor to the representative of Finland, who wishes to make a statement in explanation of vote after the voting.

Mr. Jokinen (Finland): It was our intention to explain our vote before the voting, but, with your indulgence, Madam President, I will do so now.

I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The acceding countries Bulgaria and Romania, the candidate countries the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the countries of the Stabilization and Association Process and potential candidates Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Serbia and the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) countries Iceland and Liechtenstein members of the European Economic Area, as well as Ukraine and Moldova, align themselves with this declaration.

As a result of developments that have taken place since the Third Committee ended its session, it has become necessary for the European Union to speak in explanation of vote regarding the draft resolution entitled "Global efforts for the total elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance and the comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action".

The European Union attaches the highest importance to combating all forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance. Over the years we have set up a number of institutions and policies to meet this important goal. To mention just one recent example, the year 2007 has been designated by the European Union as the European year for equal opportunities for all — a year devoted to combating all types of discrimination.

The European Union is firmly committed to the implementation of the Declaration and Programme and Action of the Durban World Conference. In accordance with our policies of combating racism and promoting human rights and multilateral, we have made a concrete, realistic and constructive follow-up to the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action. We have repeatedly stressed that, in the light of the gravity of the subject, the follow-up must be agreed by consensus and has to be carried out as a joint effort of the whole international community. Attempts to politicize the issue should be utterly rejected by all those who are genuinely committed to moving forward together on this crucial issue.

Less than three weeks ago, the Third Committee of the General Assembly adopted draft resolution III contained in report A/61/441 on global efforts for the total elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance and the comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action, presented by the Russian Federation and South Africa on behalf of the member States of the Group of 77 and the People's Republic of China.

The European Union had a number of serious concerns regarding the proposals put forward in the negotiations. However, we resolved to negotiate in good faith and sought actively to engage all delegations, including the main sponsors, so as to overcome differences and reach a conclusion that could be supported by all delegations and would make a genuine contribution to the comprehensive implementation and follow-up to the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action.

The European Union was able to vote in favour of the draft resolution, as we have done in previous years, on the basis of the following understanding, which the main sponsors of the draft resolution assured us was the framework within which it would be put to effect.

First, the review of the implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action would be conducted in the framework of the General Assembly. Secondly, the review would focus on the implementation of what was agreed at Durban and would not involve any reopening of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action. Thirdly, any preparatory work done by the Human Rights Council would not entail the creation of new mechanisms. Fourthly, the Human Rights Council would use for that end its relevant existing follow-up mechanisms, especially the intergovernmental working group on the effective implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action. Fifthly, the further study of the content and scope of substantive and procedural gaps for combating racism, as identified by the

Intergovernmental Working Group on the Effective Implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action, would be carried out by a group of five experts, who would produce a base document containing concrete recommendations on the means by which such gaps could be bridged, including, but not limited to, the possible drafting of an additional protocol to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination or the adoption of new instruments.

It was with profound dismay and surprise that the European Union, having participated in good faith in the negotiations in the General Assembly, learned a few days later of two texts, contained in documents A/HRC/3/L.2 and A/HRC/3/L.3, which had been submitted at the third session of the Human Rights Council by some of the main sponsors of the draft resolution just adopted by the Third Committee, with the support of 174 States Members of the United Nations. These texts completely contradicted both the spirit and the letter of draft resolution III in report A/61/441 and the agreed understanding explained earlier, as well as the consensus reached in Geneva at the Intergovernmental Working Group on the Effective Implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action. Such a breach of trust casts doubt on the commitment of those States to pursue a consensus approach on this issue.

We note once again that the most effective way forward is one in which all members of the international community can participate equally.

In Geneva, the European Union sought to engage the sponsors of the Human Rights Council draft resolutions in negotiations with the objective of bringing the text into agreement with the draft resolution adopted by the Third Committee. To our deep regret, our efforts met with inexplicable indifference. For obvious reasons, neither text managed to reach anything close to consensus at the Human Rights Council. We were compelled to join other delegations in voting against them.

The European Union would like to draw the attention of delegations to the fact that operative paragraphs 33 and 36 of the present resolution reflect the agreement that was reached among delegations to the Third Committee on the review of the implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action, and on the process through which the framework for combating racism is to be further developed.

It is the understanding of the European Union that this review and this process will take place transparently and by consensus, in accordance with the provisions of operative paragraphs 33 and 36, respectively, of the present resolution. Those paragraphs form the basis on which the European Union was able to vote in favour of the draft resolution in the Third Committee. Any reinterpretation of this understanding is unacceptable.

We call on the sponsors of draft resolution III to take the necessary steps in Geneva to restore the agreed course of action and ensure that the resolution just adopted by the General Assembly is properly implemented so that the Human Rights Council and the Third Committee may continue to work towards the same goal in a cohesive and coherent manner.

As we stated in the beginning of this explanation, the European Union attaches great importance to combating racism in all its forms. We intend to take an active part in the implementation of the present resolution. In doing so, we will firmly resist any effort to exploit this issue for political gain. Let us be clear. The fact that the assurances made to us by some delegations in New York were broken in Geneva is unacceptable. Negotiations cannot prosper in an atmosphere of bad faith. For its part, the European Union will continue to negotiate in good faith. We expect the same from others.

It was on that basis that the European Union was able to vote in favour of draft resolution III, just adopted by the General Assembly.

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 65?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 66

Right of peoples to self-determination

Report of the Third Committee (A/61/442)

The President: The Assembly has before it three draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 21 of its report and a draft decision recommended by the Committee in paragraph 22 of the

same report. We will now take a decision on draft resolutions I, II and III, and on the draft decision.

Draft resolution I is entitled "Universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination". The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 61/150).

The President: Draft resolution II is entitled "Use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Fiji, Liechtenstein, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Switzerland, Tonga, Vanuatu

Draft resolution II was adopted by 127 votes to 51, with 7 abstentions (resolution 61/151).

The President: Draft resolution III is entitled "The right of the Palestinian people to self-determination". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq,

Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Palau, United States of America

Abstaining:

Australia, Canada, Central African Republic, Nauru, Vanuatu

Draft resolution III was adopted by 176 votes to 5, with 5 abstentions (resolution 61/152).

[Subsequently the delegation of the Central African Republic advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The President: We turn now to the draft decision entitled, "Report of the Secretary-General on the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination". May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt the draft decision recommended by the Third Committee?

The draft decision was adopted.

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 66?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 67 (*continued*)

Promotion and protection of human rights

Report of the Third Committee (A/61/443)

The President: The Assembly has before it a draft decision recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 5 of its report. We will now take action on the draft decision. The draft decision is entitled "Reports considered by the General Assembly in connection with the promotion and protection of human rights". May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt the draft decision recommended by the Third Committee?

The draft decision was adopted.

The President: The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 67.

(a) Implementation of human rights instruments

Report of the Third Committee (A/61/443/Add.1)

The President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 10 of its report. We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The draft resolution is entitled "Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment". The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 61/153).

The President: May I take it that it is wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-item (a) of agenda item 67?

It was so decided.

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms

Report of the Third Committee (A/61/443/Add.2)

The President: The Assembly has before it 20 draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 123 of its report.

In connection with draft resolution VI, I give the floor to the representative of the Secretariat.

Ms. Kelley (Director, General Assembly and Economic and Social Council Affairs Division): I would like to inform members that, in connection with draft resolution VI, entitled "Composition of the staff of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights", under the terms of subparagraph (b) of operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would decide

> "To allow, in the effort to redress the specific geographic imbalance of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, the establishment of a temporary mechanism whereby recruitment of staff in the Office at the P-2 level would not be restricted to successful candidates from the national competitive examination".

This provision would be significantly at variance with the principle that recruitment at the P-2 level is exclusively through competitive examination, which has been affirmed repeatedly by the General Assembly, including in paragraph 15 of section III B of resolution 51/226, paragraph 17 of section V of resolution 53/221, paragraph 13 of section IV of resolution 55/258 and paragraph 7 of section II of resolution 57/305, which reaffirms the provisions of section IV of resolution 55/258.

As explained in paragraph 16 of the Secretary-General's comments on the recommendation of the Joint Inspection Unit in its report on the follow-up to the management review of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (A/61/115/Add.1), matters relating to competitive examination are under the authority of the Office of Human Resources Management, rather than the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. The Office of Human Resource Management organized, in 2005, a specialized examination in human rights, as a result of which 29 candidates were placed on the roster. Requesting the High Commissioner for Human Rights to take measures to implement the draft resolution would allow the recruitment of candidates for P-2 positions outside the roster, and could therefore prolong the time during which successful candidates would remain on the roster.

The President: I give the floor to the representative of Belarus, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote before the voting.

Ms. Petkevich (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): The delegation of the Republic of Belarus would like to take this opportunity to express its sincere gratitude to those States that voted in the Third Committee in favour of the draft resolution entitled "Promotion of equitable and mutually respectful dialogue on human rights" and to those that voted against the draft resolution entitled "Situation of human rights in Belarus" under agenda item 67 (c).

We believe that the prestige of the United Nations cannot and should not be used as a means of political pressure on sovereign States under the outlandish pretext of human rights violations. That runs counter to the very nature of our Organization. Unfortunately, we note that it is precisely those methods that are being used with regard to the Republic of Belarus.

Confrontation between States and mutual accusations have never been an effective means of resolving important international problems. It is impossible to ensure the implementation of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights by adopting politically motivated resolutions. As is well known, a stick can kill, but it will never cure.

Draft resolution XIII, entitled "Promotion of equitable and mutually respectful dialogue on human rights", takes a fundamentally different approach. The draft resolution encourages respect for the principles of equality and self-determination and the political, economic and cultural diversity of States, and underlines the importance of promoting mutual understanding among civilizations, cultures and religions through dialogue. Such an approach will facilitate the true promotion of human rights in every country.

The Republic of Belarus believes in an equitable and mutually respectful dialogue on human rights

based on an unbiased analysis of objective data on the human rights situation in a particular country.

We firmly believe that the Human Rights Council will become an authoritative body able to ensure constructive cooperation on human rights under the auspices of the United Nations. Draft resolution XIII, entitled "Promotion of equitable and mutually respectful dialogue on human rights", seeks to achieve that important goal. The draft resolution could, in fact, have been submitted under the agenda item on the reform of the United Nations.

We call on members to support draft resolution XIII. Its adoption would lay the foundation for the qualitative renewal of a major area of United Nations activities: the protection and promotion of human rights.

The President: We will now take a decision on draft resolutions I to XX, one by one. After all decisions have been taken, representatives will again have the opportunity to explain their votes.

We turn first to draft resolution I, entitled "The human rights situation arising from the recent Israeli military operations in Lebanon". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Australia, Canada, Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Palau, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Vanuatu

Draft resolution I was adopted by 112 votes to 7, with 64 abstentions (resolution 61/154).

[Subsequently, the delegation of the Central African Republic advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour; the delegation of Nauru had intended to abstain.]

The President: Draft resolution II is entitled "Missing persons".

I give the floor to the representative of Azerbaijan.

Ms. Adjalova (Azerbaijan): My delegation, as a main sponsor of draft resolution II, entitled "Missing persons", would like to point out that for technical reasons one of the final amendments to draft resolution A/C.3/61/L.19, which was agreed upon by all

delegations in the course of informal consultations in the Third Committee and appears in the final text of the draft resolution, was not included in the oral amendments made to the text when action was taken on the draft. I will therefore read out that amendment now.

The words "existing laws, practices," in operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution II should be replaced by the words "international and national legal".

This is not a new amendment; it was agreed to in the Third Committee. I am introducing it today because, for technical reasons, it was not included among the final oral amendments that were made when the draft resolution was adopted in the Third Committee. We thank all delegations for their understanding and hope that the amendment will be adopted.

The President: The representative of Azerbaijan has submitted an oral amendment to operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution II.

In accordance with rule 90 of the rules of procedure, the Assembly shall first take a decision on the amendment submitted by the representative of Azerbaijan.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt the oral amendment to operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution II submitted by the representative of Azerbaijan?

The oral amendment was adopted.

The President: Since the oral amendment to operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution II submitted by the representative of Azerbaijan has been adopted, we shall proceed to take a decision on draft resolution II, as orally amended.

The Third Committee adopted draft resolution II without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly decides to adopt draft resolution II, as orally amended?

Draft resolution II, as orally amended, was adopted (resolution 61/155).

The President: Draft resolution III is entitled "Globalization and its impact on the full enjoyment of all human rights". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former

Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Brazil, Chile, Singapore

Draft resolution III was adopted by 130 votes to 54, with 3 abstentions (resolution 61/156).

The President: Draft resolution IV is entitled "Human rights and extreme poverty". The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 61/157).

The President: Draft resolution V is entitled "Subregional Centre for Human Rights and Democracy in Central Africa". The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution V was adopted (resolution 61/158).

The President: Draft resolution VI is entitled "Composition of the staff of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Australia, Canada, Israel, Japan, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu

Draft resolution VI was adopted by 118 votes to 7, with 55 abstentions (resolution 61/159).

The President: Draft resolution VII is entitled "Promotion of a democratic and equitable international order". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of

Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Mexico, Peru

Draft resolution VII was adopted by 124 votes to 56, with 4 abstentions (resolution 61/160).

The President: Draft resolution VIII is entitled "Elimination of all forms of intolerance and of discrimination based on religion or belief". The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution VIII was adopted (resolution 61/161).

The President: Draft resolution IX is entitled "Respect for the right to universal freedom of travel and the vital importance of family reunification". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, Marshall Islands, Palau, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution IX was adopted by 122 votes to 4, with 58 abstentions (resolution 61/162).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Brunei Darussalam informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.]

The President: Draft resolution X is entitled "The right to food". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Draft resolution X was adopted by 185 votes to 1 (resolution 61/163).

The President: Draft resolution XI is entitled "Combating defamation of religions". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Comoros,

Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Armenia, Bolivia, Botswana, Cape Verde, Colombia, Fiji, Haiti, India, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Nepal, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu

Draft resolution XI was adopted by 111 votes to 54, with 18 abstentions (resolution 61/164).

The President: Draft resolution XII is entitled "Protection of migrants". The Third Committee adopted draft resolution XII without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution XII was adopted (resolution 61/165).

The President: Draft resolution XIII is entitled "Promotion of equitable and mutually respectful dialogue on human rights". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Gabon, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Tuvalu, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal,

Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay

Abstaining:

Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Bahamas, Barbados, Brazil, Burundi, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Dominica, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guyana, Jamaica, Jordan, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu

Draft resolution XIII was adopted by 86 votes to 64, with 26 abstentions (resolution 61/166).

The President: Draft resolution XIV is entitled "Regional arrangements for the promotion and protection of human rights". The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XIV was adopted (resolution 61/167).

The President: Draft resolution XV is entitled "Enhancement of international cooperation in the field of human rights". The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XV was adopted (resolution 61/168).

The President: Draft resolution XVI is entitled "The right to development". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution XVI was adopted by 134 votes to 53 (resolution 61/169).

The President: Draft resolution XVII is entitled "Human rights and unilateral coercive measures". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution XVII was adopted by 131 votes to 54 (resolution 61/170).

The President: Draft resolution XVIII is entitled "Protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism". The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XVIII was adopted (resolution 61/171).

The President: Draft resolution XIX is entitled "Hostage-taking". The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XIX was adopted (resolution 61/172).

The President: Draft resolution XX is entitled "Extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions". Separate votes have been requested on operative paragraph 4 and operative paragraph 5 (b).

If there are no objections to those requests, I shall first put to the vote operative paragraph 4. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and

Principe, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, China, Dominica, Egypt, El Salvador, Guyana, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mongolia, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sudan, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Belarus, Congo, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, India, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Liberia, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Russian Federation, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Thailand, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Zambia

Operative paragraph 4 was retained by 104 votes to 31, with 29 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of El Salvador advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour; the delegations of Brunei Darussalam, Jamaica and the Syrian Arab Republic had intended to vote against; the delegation of Tunisia had intended to abstain.]

The President: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 5 (b) of draft resolution XX. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Montenegro, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

Afghanistan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, China, Djibouti, Egypt, Guinea, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Burundi, Congo, Dominica, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guyana, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Liberia, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia

Operative paragraph 5 (b) of draft resolution XX was retained by 105 votes to 30, with 30 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of the United States of America informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour; the delegation of Brunei Darussalam had intended to vote against; the delegation of Niger had intended to abstain;

and the delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic had intended not to participate in the voting.]

The President: I shall now put to the vote draft resolution XX as a whole, as amended.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brunei Darussalam, China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Myanmar, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Viet Nam, Yemen

Draft resolution XX as a whole, was adopted by 137 votes to none, with 43 abstentions (resolution 61/173).

The President: I now call on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic for an explanation of vote.

Mr. Elji (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): I should like to explain Syria's vote on resolution 61/161 on the elimination of all forms of intolerance and of discrimination based on religion or belief.

The Syrian Arab Republic rejects all forms of extremism and discrimination on the basis of religion or belief, given the long history of tolerance of our people, who have been blessed in receiving the three monotheistic religions. In view of its faith and belief in the need to condemn all forms of discrimination and to promote dialogue to increase mutual respect and understanding, my delegation joined the consensus on the resolution, which emphasizes the need to avoid equating any religion with terrorism and calls on the United Nations to play a pioneering role in addressing extremism.

However, we express our strong reservations concerning operative paragraph 4 (a), which runs counter to the tenets and holy teachings of the Islamic faith.

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-item (b) of agenda item 67?

It was so decided.

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives

Report of the Third Committee (A/61/443/Add.3)

The President: The Assembly has before it four draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 70 of its report.

Before proceeding further, I should like to inform members that action on draft resolution II, entitled "Situation of human rights in Myanmar", is postponed to a later date to allow time for the review of its programme budget implications by the Fifth Committee. The Assembly will take action on draft resolution II as soon as the report of the Fifth Committee on its programme budget implications is available.

I now call on the representative of Belarus, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote before the voting.

Ms. Petkevich (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): In the Third Committee, a representative of the United States once rightly noted that there should be substantial reasons to initiate a country-specific draft resolution. There are absolutely no such reasons for the draft resolution entitled "Situation of human rights in Belarus".

Belarus is a party to all universal human rights instruments and participates actively in international cooperation aimed at promoting and protecting human rights in all countries. The Government of Belarus fulfils in good faith its commitments related to the promotion and protection of human rights, as set out in its constitution, in international treaties to which it is a party and in its national legislation.

It is absolutely absurd to raise the issue of human rights abuses in relation to a country with a socially oriented economy — a country whose entire State policy is aimed at the social and legal protection of its people. One should not disregard the concrete and undeniable achievements of Belarus. Our poverty rate has decreased to one fourth of what it was five years ago; it is now the lowest among all countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States. Our unemployment rate is a mere 1.2 per cent, while the disparity in personal incomes is maintained within socially acceptable limits. Our civil society is constantly developing. In Belarus, there are 17 political parties, with more than 1,000 organizational branches; 37 trade unions, with nearly 23,000 local organizations; and nearly 2,300 civic organizations, with more than 11,000 local branches.

One often hears criticism of Belarus for alleged restrictions on freedom of speech and freedom of the press. But how can there be talk about monopolization and restrictions on the freedom of the mass media when in Belarus the number of independent publications is three times larger than the number of State-owned publications and when the number of foreign mass media publications has grown to more than 6,000? In our country, which is not very large in terms of territory and population, there are 3,090 religious organizations, representing 25 religious faiths and denominations.

All of that shows that in Belarus an effective State system has been established that guarantees the enjoyment of civil, political, social and economic rights by Belarusian citizens and by our guests from other countries. To fail to take that into account when we are considering this draft anti-Belarus resolution is not right.

We have no reason to hide anything from the international community. We reaffirm once again our interest and our readiness to engage in an open, equitable and mutually respectful dialogue with all our international partners in order to find mutually acceptable solutions to existing disagreements.

Belarus cooperates with the human rights treaty bodies and with the thematic special procedures of the Human Rights Council, and we intend to intensify that cooperation. The unfounded accusations that the initiators of the draft resolution entitled "Situation of human rights in Belarus" are attempting to present as an opinion of the world community will only increase mutual misunderstanding and mistrust. We will consider any votes cast in favour of the draft resolution on the situation of human rights in Belarus as an unfriendly act of gross and illegitimate interference in the internal affairs of Belarus.

In the General Assembly, we would like to remind the United States of America and the United Kingdom — the sponsors of this draft resolution — about their commitments to the Republic of Belarus, assumed in accordance with the Memorandum on Security Assurances in connection with the Republic of Belarus' accession to the Treaty on the

Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, signed in Budapest on 5 December 1994. Paragraph 3 of the Memorandum states:

> "The United States of America, the Russian Federation and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland reaffirm their commitment to the Republic of Belarus, in accordance with the principles of the CSCE Final Act, to refrain from economic coercion designed to subordinate to their own interest the exercise by the Republic of Belarus of the rights inherent in its sovereignty and thus to secure advantages of any kind."

And what do we have in reality? The United States Congress adopts the so-called "Belarus Democracy Act", which authorizes the allocation of funds for, in effect, changing the constitutional order of a sovereign State. The European Union is considering economic sanctions against Belarus, which would inevitably undermine the standard of living of the Belarussian people — the very people whose rights are supposedly being defended. The United States and the European Union are making an unprecedented effort to push through the United Nations an anti-Belarussian draft resolution with no objective basis.

All of that should serve as a useful lesson to those countries that are being promised political and economic guarantees in exchange for meeting the demands levelled at them. How much are such guarantees worth? Belarus has learned their true cost at first hand.

There can be no universal model of State development designed by any one person. Blueprints are unacceptable in that regard, since the issue is the destiny of an entire nation and the status of a sovereign State — and I emphasize "sovereign".

Belarus consistently and successfully fulfils the recommendations put forward by the United Nations and its specialized agencies. Our accomplishments in that respect are perfectly evident. In their desire to move forward, the leaders of Belarus are disoriented when such successes are ignored. It would seem that, regardless of whether or not we make progress, the assessment will always be negative. Progress should be stimulated, not repudiated. We appeal to all States to act on principle and to vote in favour of the no action motion on the draft resolution on the situation of human rights in Belarus, or against the draft resolution should it come to a vote.

The President: We will now take a decision on draft resolutions I, III and IV.

Draft resolution I is entitled "Situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Canada, Chile, Comoros, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu

Against:

Algeria, Belarus, China, Congo, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Guinea, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia,

Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Guyana, India, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Qatar, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Yemen, Zambia

Draft resolution I was adopted by 99 votes to 21, with 56 abstentions (resolution 61/174).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Pakistan advised the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.]

The President: Draft resolution III is entitled "Situation of human rights in Belarus".

I call on the representative of the Russian Federation on a point of order.

Mr. Rogachev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): Under the terms of rule 74 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the Russian Federation proposes that no action be taken on draft resolution III on the situation of human rights in Belarus. The procedural proposal is based primarily on the lack of a problem as a focus of substantive discussion. It is also based on Russia's principled position aimed at depoliticizing the work of the United Nations human rights system.

We view the draft resolution on the human rights situation in Belarus as an extremely politicized measure dictated by self-serving considerations that are irrelevant to the genuine defence of human rights. Our assessment was borne out by the unacceptable actions in the Security Council by the draft resolution's sponsors, which seek to exploit the rostrum of any United Nations body to exert pressure on sovereign States of which they disapprove.

On that basis, the Russian Federation asks delegations to vote in favour of the no-action motion concerning draft resolution III on the situation of human rights in Belarus.

The President: The representative of the Russian Federation has moved, within the terms of rule 74 of the rules of procedure, that no action be taken on draft resolution III. Rule 74 reads as follows:

> "During the discussion of any matter, a representative may move the adjournment of the debate on the item under discussion. In addition to the proposer of the motion, two representatives may speak in favour of, and two against, the motion, after which the motion shall be immediately put to the vote. The President may limit the time to be allowed to speakers under this rule."

Two speakers have asked to speak in favour of the motion, and I give them the floor.

Mr. Liu Zhenmin (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation wishes to express its support for the no action motion put forward by the Russian Federation concerning draft resolution III.

It has been the Chinese delegation's consistent view that countries should promote human rights through equitable and mutually respectful dialogue. We oppose the practice of submitting country-specific draft resolutions on human rights. We believe that such draft resolutions only exacerbate mistrust and confrontation among countries, and in no way contribute to improving and promoting human rights in various countries.

We therefore support the no action motion proposed by the Russian delegation, and appeal to other delegations to follow suit.

Mr. Amorós Núñez (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The delegation of Cuba wishes in turn to support the motion made by the Russian Federation. We believe that the draft resolution submitted by the United States is not based on a genuine interest in cooperation on human rights issues. In our opinion, it exploits the issue of human rights for political purposes on the basis of selectivity and double standards, as evidenced by the selective treatment of this matter. It runs counter to the new spirit of cooperation that we have allegedly promoted with the establishment of the Human Rights Council and its new mechanisms, such as the universal periodic review. The United States has no right to encourage initiatives like this, which are diametrically opposed to genuine cooperation in relation to human rights.

Cuba therefore reiterates its support for the motion and requests all Member States to vote in its favour.

The President: Two representatives have asked to speak against the motion, and I give them the floor.

Mr. Miller (United States of America): I am pleased to be delivering this statement on behalf of the United States, Andorra, Australia, Canada, Japan, Israel, Liechtenstein and San Marino.

We regret that a procedural no action motion has been requested in the plenary of the General Assembly. We submit that the spirit of this deliberative institution calls for draft resolutions to be considered on their merits. It would be a disservice to our mission as a universal body with responsibility for promoting human rights to prevent open discussions and decisions with procedural motions.

On 22 November, the Third Committee of the General Assembly — the only universal body responsible for human rights issues — debated and soundly adopted the draft resolution on the situation of human rights in Belarus by a margin of 39 votes. It also reaffirmed its authority and responsibility to promote and protect human rights, and defeated a similar no action motion initiative.

We urge all Member States to vote against the procedural motion because the use of such a procedural motion in the General Assembly will undermine the work, authority and responsibility of the only — I repeat, only — universal body of the United Nations responsible for the promotion and protection of human rights. A no action motion in the General Assembly after the Committee has recommended the draft resolution to the Assembly for adoption signifies a complete disregard for the Third Committee and its decision-making process.

We therefore strongly urge all Member States to vote against the motion.

Mr. Jokinen (Finland): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The acceding countries Bulgaria and Romania; the candidate countries Croatia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the countries of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidates Albania, Montenegro and Serbia; the European Free Trade Association country Iceland, member of the European Economic Area; as well as Ukraine and Moldova align themselves with this declaration.

There should be no question about the General Assembly's mandate to look into human rights situations in order to promote and encourage respect for human rights, one of the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. The General Assembly has adopted resolutions expressing its concern about the worst human rights situations for decades.

The call of a motion now to adjourn debate represents an attempt to prevent the consideration of a draft resolution on procedural grounds. The calling of such a motion aims at denying the States Members of the United Nations their sovereign right to bring before the General Assembly any concern that they themselves deem to merit its attention, and at limiting the agenda of the General Assembly.

Furthermore, the Third Committee has already voted on the same motion and decided not to adopt it. Accordingly, the Third Committee has already considered, on its merits, the draft resolution on the situation of human rights in Belarus and deemed it worthy of adoption. A no action motion on the draft resolution in a plenary meeting of the General Assembly is therefore a vote of no confidence in the Third Committee. It undermines that body.

It is an important matter of principle for the European Union to vote against any motion to close the debate on an item under discussion, even more so in a plenary meeting of the General Assembly. The calling of the motion is clearly aimed at preventing the United Nations from dealing with the situation of human rights in Belarus. No country large or small can be regarded as being beyond or above consideration by international human rights forums. That would run counter to the principles of universality and interdependence of all human rights.

The Third Committee of the General Assembly has already addressed the situation of human rights in Belarus, based on the gravity of the situation on the ground. By choosing not to address the situation, we would show callous disregard for the very people whose human rights and fundamental freedoms we have committed ourselves to protecting.

If successful, the motion to adjourn the debate would prevent us from even considering the issues covered in the draft resolution and already adopted by

the Third Committee. That runs contrary not only to the good practice of the General Assembly, but also to the spirit of dialogue to which we are all attached. The General Assembly would undermine its own credibility if it remained silent on grave and widespread violations of human rights in situations where the country concerned refuses to cooperate in any meaningful manner with the United Nations human rights system.

The European Union strongly urges delegations to vote against the motion to adjourn the debate for reasons of principle, regardless of their voting intentions on the draft resolution on the situation of human rights in Belarus.

The President: I shall now put to the vote the motion submitted by the representative of the Russian Federation that no action be taken on draft resolution III.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Central African Republic, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu

Abstaining:

Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Burundi, Cape Verde, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Djibouti, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritius, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkmenistan, Uganda

The motion was rejected by 67 votes to 79, with 32 abstentions.

The President: Since the motion for no action was not adopted, the Assembly will proceed to take a decision on draft resolution III. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Palau, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tonga,

Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu

Against:

Algeria, Armenia, Bangladesh, Belarus, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, South Africa, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Ecuador, Eritrea, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zambia

Draft resolution III was adopted by 72 votes to 32, with 69 abstentions (resolution 61/175).

The President: Draft resolution IV is entitled "Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran".

I call on the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

Mr. Rezvani (Islamic Republic of Iran): Thank you very much, Madam President, for giving me the floor before the consideration of draft resolution IV, entitled "Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran". I wish to invoke rule 74 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and request that no action be taken on that draft resolution. I would also like to briefly bring to the attention of members the following points.

Resolution 61/166, entitled "Promotion of equitable and mutually respectful dialogue on human rights", just adopted by this body, stresses, inter alia, stressed the need to avoid politically motivated and biased country-specific resolutions on the situation of human rights, confrontational approaches, exploitation of human rights for political purposes, selective targeting of individual countries for extraneous considerations and double standards in the work of the United Nations on human rights issues.

Last September, the heads of State and Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, during their fourteenth Summit, held in Havana, emphasized that the exploitation of human rights for political purposes, including the selective targeting of individual countries for extraneous considerations, which is contrary to the founding principles of the Movement and the United Nations Charter, should be prohibited. Furthermore, it should be noted that the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the African Union have adopted virtually the same position.

In view of the explicit and widespread support for opposing country-specific resolutions, I wish, as I said, to invoke rule 74 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. By voting in favour of this no-action motion, delegations would remove a serious obstacle to dialogue and would enable all of us, including my delegation, to cooperate further to promote and protect human rights, rather than insisting on the adoption of country-specific draft resolutions.

The President: The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran has moved, within the terms of rule 74 of the rules of procedure, that no action be taken on draft resolution IV. Rule 74 reads as follows.

> "During the discussion of any matter, a representative may move the adjournment of the debate on the item under discussion. In addition to the proposer of the motion, two representatives may speak in favour of, and two against, the motion, after which the motion shall be immediately put to the vote."

Two speakers have asked to speak in favour of the motion, and I give them the floor.

Mr. Hayee (Pakistan): The Pakistan delegation supports the motion introduced by the delegation of Iran that no action be taken on draft resolution IV, entitled "Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran". The Pakistan delegation requests all delegations to support the motion.

Mr. Kitchen (Zimbabwe): My delegation supports the proposal by the Islamic Republic of Iran that no action be taken on draft resolution IV. We believe that such draft resolutions are a departure from the approach to human rights that was agreed in resolution 60/251. We therefore urge all Member States to support the motion.

The President: Two speakers have asked to speak against the motion, and I give them the floor.

Mr. McNee (Canada): I am pleased to speak today on behalf of Canada, Australia, Liechtenstein, Norway, the United States, San Marino and Andorra. We very much regret that a no-action motion has been introduced in the plenary of the General Assembly. That is an extraordinary initiative to stifle debate and to undermine the jurisdiction and the responsibilities of the Assembly.

On 21 November 2006, the Third Committee adopted the draft resolution on the situation of human rights in Iran by a very clear margin after a no-action motion had been introduced and had failed. Let me repeat: this draft resolution was adopted in the Third Committee after a similar no-action motion had been rejected. The draft resolution was then recommended by the Third Committee to the General Assembly for its consideration today.

As I said at the time in the Third Committee, any country-specific draft resolution in the field of human rights should be considered on its individual merits, but preventing debate on certain country situations would presume that certain countries are beyond or above consideration by international human rights forums.

It is for that reason that we are firmly opposed to procedural motions whose primary purpose is to stifle debate on situations of serious human rights concern. Indeed, I should like to recall that it is for that reason that Canada, as a matter of principle, did not bring forward a no-action motion in the Third Committee on the draft resolution proposed by Iran on the situation of indigenous people and immigrants in Canada, despite our firm belief that that draft resolution did not stand up to scrutiny on its merits.

The use of a procedural device in the General Assembly is even more egregious, however. A no-action motion in the Assembly after the same no-action motion has been attempted and has failed in Committee, and after the Committee has recommended the draft resolution to the Assembly for adoption, undermines the Third Committee and is dismissive of its decision-making. Such a motion seeks to prevent the General Assembly from acting upon the recommendation of the Third Committee. That would have the effect of undermining the work of the Third Committee, the only United Nations body responsible for human rights with universal membership, as well as undermining the work of the General Assembly itself. We therefore strongly urge all Member States to vote against this motion.

Mr. Jokinen (Finland): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The acceding countries Bulgaria and Romania, the candidate countries Croatia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the countries of the Stabilization and Association Process and potential candidates Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia, and the European Free Trade Association country Iceland, member of the European Economic Area, as well as Ukraine and Moldova, align themselves with this declaration.

The European Union regrets that it is necessary for us once again to take the floor in a plenary meeting of the General Assembly against a motion of no action.

There should be no question about the General Assembly's mandate to look into human rights situations in order to promote and encourage respect for human rights, one of the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. The General Assembly has passed resolutions expressing its concern about the worst human rights situations for decades.

The call of a motion now to adjourn debate represents an attempt to prevent the consideration of a draft resolution on procedural grounds. The calling of such a motion aims at denying the States Members of the United Nations their sovereign right to bring before the General Assembly any concern that they themselves deem to merit its attention, and at limiting the agenda of the General Assembly.

Furthermore, the Third Committee has already voted upon the same motion and decided not to adopt it. Accordingly, the Third Committee has already considered, on its merits, the draft resolution on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran and deemed it worthy of adoption. A no action motion on the draft resolution in a plenary meeting of the General Assembly is therefore a vote of no confidence in the Third Committee. It undermines that body.

It is an important matter of principle for the European Union to vote against any motion to close the debate on an item under discussion, even more so in a plenary meeting of the General Assembly. The calling of the motion is clearly aimed at preventing the United Nations from dealing with the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran. No country large or small can be regarded as being beyond or above consideration by international human rights forums. That would run counter to the principles of universality and interdependence of all human rights.

The Third Committee of the General Assembly has already addressed the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran based on the gravity of the situation on the ground. By choosing not to address the situation, we would show callous disregard for the very people whose human rights and fundamental freedoms we have committed ourselves to protecting.

If successful, the motion to adjourn the debate would prevent us from even considering the issues covered in the draft resolution and already adopted by the Third Committee. That runs contrary not only to the good practice of the General Assembly but also to the spirit of dialogue to which we are all attached. The General Assembly would undermine its own credibility if it remained silent on grave and widespread violations of human rights in situations where the country concerned refuses to cooperate in any meaningful manner with the United Nations human rights system.

The European Union strongly urges delegations to vote against the motion to adjourn the debate for reasons of principle, regardless of their voting intentions on the draft resolution on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran.

The President: I shall now put to the vote the motion submitted by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran that no action be taken on draft resolution IV.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Central African Republic, China, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burundi, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu

Abstaining:

Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Cape Verde, Colombia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guyana, Jamaica, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Nepal, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda

The motion was rejected by 75 votes to 81, with 24 abstentions.

The President: Since the motion for no action was not adopted, the Assembly will proceed to take a decision on draft resolution IV. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Belize, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burundi, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Palau, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Vanuatu

Against:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Brunei Darussalam, China, Comoros, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Georgia, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Jamaica, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Zambia

Draft resolution IV was adopted by 72 votes to 50, with 55 abstentions (resolution 61/176).

The President: I shall now give the floor to those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote on the resolutions just adopted.

Mr. Shinyo (Japan): As my delegation has already made a statement on the adoption of the resolution on the human rights situation in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in the Third Committee, we will not repeat what was said.

I should like first, however, of course to say "thank you very much" to all countries that supported the resolution. This time, so many countries — nearly 100 — voted in favour of the resolution, and we appreciate that very much. It is a sign of the resolve of the majority of the General Assembly to support the resolution.

We should like, however, to state that Japan strongly urges that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea take seriously the fact that the General Assembly has adopted the resolution. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea should fully cooperate with the United Nations system, including with Special Rapporteur Vitit Muntarbhorn. In particular, we strongly urge the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to respond honestly to inquiries into the abductions matter, admit that its actions violated human rights, allow the abducted survivors to return to

Japan or other countries of origin without delay, and, finally, immediately conduct a thorough investigation and surrender the perpetrators who were responsible for the abductions.

Ms. Lintonen (Finland): I have the honour to deliver this statement on behalf of Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, the Federated States of Micronesia, Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Nepal, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Turkey, Tuvalu, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Ukraine, Uruguay, Vanuatu and Venezuela.

The right of everyone to life was universally affirmed in article 3 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and reaffirmed in other international instruments, such as article 6 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and articles 6 and 37 (a) of the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Over the past decade, the Commission on Human Rights adopted in all consecutive sessions a resolution on the question of the death penalty, expressing deep concern at its continuing use around the world and calling upon States that still maintain the death penalty to abolish it completely and, in the meantime, to establish a moratorium on executions.

We firmly believe that the abolition of the death penalty contributes to the enhancement of human dignity and the progressive development of human rights. The death penalty provides no added value in terms of deterrence. Any miscarriage or failure of justice is irreversible when, in a cruel and inhumane way, the punishment deprives one of his or her right to life. The signatories of this statement are pleased to note that the trend towards the worldwide abolition of the death penalty continues, and they welcome the abolition of capital punishment in three States over the past year, together with positive developments towards its complete abolition in many other countries.

However, despite these developments, there is still cause for great alarm. The signatories of this statement remain deeply concerned about the resort to the death penalty all over the world.

The signatories of this statement commit themselves to working towards the abolition of the death penalty and, where the death penalty still exists, call for its use to be progressively restricted, insist that it be carried out according to minimum standards such as those set out in Economic and Social Council resolution 1984/50, and, in the meantime, call for the establishment of a moratorium on executions.

The signatories call upon the General Assembly to be seized of this matter in the future.

Mr. Cheok (Singapore): It is indeed unfortunate that we once again find ourselves exchanging words on the death penalty at this very strange point in time. We had almost made it through the main part of this session of the General Assembly without resorting to such a repetitive exchange. But it seems that old habits die hard. Some delegations have consistently tried to portray this as a human rights issue. They claim that this is a matter of cruelty and inhumane treatment. They have repeatedly tried to impose upon all Member States their views on the death penalty.

The reality is that there is no international consensus on whether the death penalty is a violation of human rights. We do not think that it is. Indeed, a large group of countries have always dissociated themselves from resolutions on the abolition of the death penalty. For a large number of countries, the death penalty is a criminal justice issue. It is imposed for the most serious crimes and serves as a deterrent to would-be offenders. Every citizen also has a right to live in a safe environment, free from criminal threat to their lives and personal safety.

Singapore's position is very simple. Every country has the sovereign right to decide on its own criminal justice system. Whether to maintain or to abolish the death penalty is a question of national choice. Each society has to judge what is best for its people, according to its unique circumstances. Respect for human rights must include respect for differences in systems and practices. Tolerance of diversity cannot

be restricted only to positions with which one agrees. In the absence of international consensus, countries on either side of the argument have no right to impose their opinions. Opinions are not self-evident truths that brook no dissent. A little modesty would go a long way towards promoting genuine dialogue — assuming, of course, that there is a desire for genuine dialogue.

My delegation respects the right of others to decide on their own systems. If this means the abolition of the death penalty in their respective societies, then we respect that decision. We do not seek to impose our views. All we ask is that the same treatment — the same basic courtesy — be extended to us.

Mr. Suárez (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): Colombia, a country that has suffered from the scourge of kidnapping but that has decisively confronted the actions of the criminal groups responsible for those terrible crimes in our country, thereby considerably reducing the number of kidnappings, would like to express its solidarity with the victims of kidnapping and their families in all nations. We call on all States to take actions and decisions to effectively deal with that reprehensible crime and demand the unconditional release of all those have been kidnapped, regardless of the nature or the claimed motives of those responsible.

Mr. Khammanichanh (Lao People's Democratic Republic): My delegation would like to explain its vote on resolution 61/174, entitled "Situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea".

States Members of the United Nations that are party to international conventions on human rights have been consistently meeting their obligations. My delegation is of the view that the promotion of human rights should be addressed on the basis of each country's specific reality and historical evolution. Regrettably, however, the contents of the resolution are not in line with those principles. Our delegation therefore voted against the resolution.

We understand the concerns of the international community regarding the issue of abduction and express our sympathy to the victims of such acts. My delegation hopes that whenever they occur, they will be resolved in a constructive and peaceful manner.

Mr. Pekarchuk (Ukraine): Upon instructions from my capital, I am to deliver the following statement in explanation of vote on draft resolution III.

The delegation of Ukraine supported draft resolution III, entitled "Situation of human rights in Belarus". Ukraine is interested in the democratic development of the Republic of Belarus on the basis of respect for human rights and the rule of law. We consider actions that could isolate the Republic of Belarus — an important neighbour — to have a counterproductive effect. Ukraine supports the establishment of an effective dialogue and cooperation between the Republic of Belarus and international human rights mechanisms, including the Human Rights Council, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and the Council of Europe, as well as the human rights treaty bodies.

Mr. Outlule (Botswana): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution I, "Situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea".

Although the delegation of Botswana abstained in the voting on the draft resolution, we would like to place it on record that, had paragraph 1 (b) (v) been put to the vote, we would have voted in favour of it. In paragraph 1 (b) (v), the General Assembly expresses its very serious concern at

> "Unresolved questions of international concern relating to the abduction of foreigners in the form of enforced disappearance, which violates the human rights of the nationals of other sovereign countries".

We wish to place on record that this is a matter that we consider to be very serious and that it needs to be addressed immediately. Thus, we would have voted in favour of paragraph 1 (b) (v) had it been put to a vote.

Mr. Sin Song Chol (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): It was not the intention of my delegation to take the floor at this stage, but, owing to the lack of factual content in the statement made by the delegation of Japan, my delegation is obliged to explain its position regarding the issue raised by the Japanese delegation.

First of all, the Japanese delegation stated that the vote has demonstrated that a majority of United Nations Member States support the resolution on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. However, I would like to remind the Japanese delegation that if its members had a good sense of mathematical

calculation, they could also see that another majority of Member States voted against the resolution.

That said, my delegation wishes to make the following comments regarding the issue that was raised in the statement by the Japanese delegation.

The Korean people have a deep-seated grudge towards Japan, which has to be paid with blood. Japan, during the 40-odd years of its occupation of Korea, forcibly drafted and abducted 8.4 million Koreans and forced military sexual slavery on 200,000 women and girls — I repeat, 200,000 women and girls. Even today, after more than half a century, we do not know the whereabouts of most of those victims. The Japanese authorities who make a fuss about human rights and the rule of law are not giving a sincere and coherent response concerning the fate of those victims, and they have neither apologized nor honestly compensated for Japan's past crimes against humanity.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea maintains high vigilance against the threats posed by Japan in cooperation with the United States. Fully aware of its responsibility for the history and destiny of its people, as well as for peace and security on the Korean peninsula and in the Asia-Pacific region, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is accelerating its efforts to be fully prepared to resolutely counter any threats coming from Japan.

My delegation would like to conclude by urging the Japanese delegation to fully implement the Pyongyang Declaration, which is a real, historic document setting forth the road map for the development of bilateral relations between our two countries, instead of using it as an excuse for Japan to evade its responsibility and historical accountability for its wrongdoing. We urge the Japanese authorities to respect and fully implement the Declaration instead of debasing it.

Mr. Muhumuza (Uganda): As this is the first time I have taken the floor, I would like to congratulate you, Madam President, on the way in which you are conducting our deliberations.

My delegation has observed a disproportionate number of delegations voting in a manner in which they had not intended to vote. I would urge that the causes of that phenomenon be examined with a view to rectification.

The President: I now call on the representative of Belarus, who wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply. May I remind members that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, statements in exercise of the right of reply are limited to 10 minutes for the first intervention and to five minutes for the second, and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Ms. Petkevich (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): Belarus deeply regrets the adoption of resolution 61/175, entitled "The situation of human rights in Belarus". That resolution has nothing to do with human rights; it represents nothing more than the sponsors' imposition on the international community of their unilateral negative assessment of the internal and external policies of Belarus. The content of this document is based on humiliating, unfounded accusations, and the process of its adoption was based on unwillingness and lack of interest with regard to hearing the Belarusian side.

The accusations contained in the resolution are not new. Our opponents constantly use them in the context of bilateral relations and regional organizations. Now they are attempting to drag the General Assembly into this aggressive propaganda campaign to discredit the Government and the people of Belarus.

In our view, the resolution entitled "The situation of human rights in Belarus" creates no political or other kind of commitments for Belarus. The result of the voting shows that the opinion of the document's authors does not reflect the position of the international community. The majority of United Nations Member States did not vote in favour of the resolution. They did not believe its spurious allegations and did not endorse its unfounded and inappropriate demands.

At the same time, we would note that the adoption of this resolution will in no way have a negative impact on the cooperation of Belarus with United Nations human rights bodies. Belarus will continue, as before, to intensify that cooperation and to make our utmost contribution to the work of the General Assembly, the Human Rights Council, the Economic and Social Council and other United Nations bodies to promote and protect human rights in all countries.

In conclusion, I would like to sincerely thank our friends and all those who share our position for their support in opposing the adoption of this destructive document aimed against the Republic of Belarus.

The President: The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of sub-item (c) of agenda item 67.

Programme of work

The President: Before adjourning this meeting, I would like to consult representatives regarding an extension of the work of the Fifth Committee. Members will recall that, at its 72nd plenary meeting, on 11 December 2006, the General Assembly decided to extend the work of the Fifth Committee until Tuesday, 19 December. However, as the Fifth Committee has not yet completed its work, I propose that the Assembly further extend the work of the Fifth Committee until Thursday, 21 December.

In the absence of objection, may I take it that the General Assembly agrees to that proposal?

It was so decided.

The President: I would like to inform members that, owing to the lateness of the hour, we shall take up the remaining items tomorrow morning after the Assembly has taken action on draft resolution I, entitled "International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance", contained in the report of the Third Committee (A/61/448), under agenda item 68, entitled Report of the Human Rights Council.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.